UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/031,992	01/25/2002	Laurent Frerebeau	T3264-907643	8715

181	7590	05/12/2005

MILES & STOCKBRIDGE PC
1751 PINNACLE DRIVE
SUITE 500
MCLEAN, VA 22102-3833

EXAMINER
HILLERY, NATHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/031,992	FREREBEAU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan Hillery	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **3** MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 February 2005*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *14-17, 19 and 21-28* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *14-17, 19 and 21-28* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 February 2005* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:

         1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

         3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20050509

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 2/09/05.

2.   Claims 14 – 17, 19 and 21 – 28 are pending in the case. Claims 14, 23, 24, 27,

and 28 are independent.

3.   The objection to the Drawings has been withdrawn as necessitated by

amendment.

4.   The objection to the Claims has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

5.   The rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being

indefinite has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

6.   The rejection of claims 14 – 17, 19 – 25, 27, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable has been maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 14 – 17, 19, 21 – 25, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over CompuServe (WO97/18516) [as cited by Applicant].

9.   **Regarding independent claim 14**, CompuServe teaches that *translation of Web*

pages, in either the bundled browser/MT configuration or the web server configuration,

requires processing HTML codes containing reference, command, and display

information. Preferably, the HTML codes are identified prior to translation, then

surrounded by special boundary markers to block the translation process on the codes.
The HTML preprocessor uses its knowledge regarding the markups, codes, data
characters and the structure of HTML documents to determine which codes should be
blocked from the translation process. After translation is complete, a postprocessing
program removes the special boundary markers so that the necessary references,
commands, and display characteristics are available in the translated text (page 9, line
18 – page 10, line 2), which provide for **detecting a localization tag** (HTML codes) **in**
the document; retrieving, from the document, localization information (reference)
associated with said localization tag; and replacing said localization tag in the
document with the localized value (translation) **found in the translation file.**
CompuServe does not explicitly teach **searching...** However, it would have been
obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of CompuServe in
order to provide for **searching a translation file for a localized value associated with**
the localization information, since CompuServe does disclose that *optionally, the user*
may be able to update and edit parts of the MT software's electronic dictionaries to
include terminology common to the Web sites he visits (page 8, lines 19 – 20).

10.   **Regarding dependent claim 15**, CompuServe teaches that *translation of Web*
pages, in either the bundled browser/MT configuration or the web server configuration,
requires processing HTML codes containing reference, command, and display
information (page 9, lines 18 – 20), which provides that **said localization information**
includes at least one of a localization attribute, a default localization value, and a
value corresponding to an automatic transcription function.

11.   **Regarding dependent claims 16 and 17**, CompuServe teaches that *translation*

of Web pages, in either the bundled browser/MT configuration or the web server

configuration, requires processing HTML codes containing reference, command, and

display information (page 9, lines 18 – 20), which provides for **detecting said**

localization tag based on the type of document identified in said identifying step;

and recognizing at least one of grammar and syntax used in the document based

on the type of document identified in said identifying step. CompuServe does not

explicitly teach **identifying**. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to modify and/or use the invention

of CompuServe to provide for **identifying a type of the document**, since the invention

processes HTML codes and may not work on other web pages that utilize another

markup language, the skilled artisan wants to insure the invention processes HTML.

12.   **Regarding dependent claim 19**, CompuServe teaches that *the HTML codes are*

identified prior to translation (page 9, line 20), which provides that **said tag is a markup**

language tag.

13.   **Regarding dependent claim 21**, CompuServe does not explicitly teach **creating**

the translation file. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art to modify the teachings of CompuServe in order to provide for **creating the**

translation file to include information which associates said localization

information with said localized value, since CompuServe does disclose that *the user*

may be able to update and edit parts of the MT software's electronic dictionaries to

include terminology common to the Web sites he visits (page 8, lines 19 – 20).

14.   **Regarding dependent claim 22**, CompuServe teaches that *translation of Web*

pages, in either the bundled browser/MT configuration or the web server configuration,

requires processing HTML codes containing reference, command, and display

information. Preferably, the HTML codes are identified prior to translation, then

surrounded by special boundary markers to block the translation process on the codes.

The HTML preprocessor uses its knowledge regarding the markups, codes, data

characters and the structure of HTML documents to determine which codes should be

blocked from the translation process. After translation is complete, a postprocessing

program removes the special boundary markers so that the necessary references,

commands, and display characteristics are available in the translated text (page 9, line

18 – page 10, line 2), which provide for **loading code used to implement said**

localization tool into the document, said code dynamically generating additional

code; and performing said replacing step as said additional code is dynamically

generated by said code used to implement said localization tool.

15.   **Regarding independent claim 23**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 14, and is rejected along the same rationale.

16.   **Regarding independent claim 24**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 14, and is rejected along the same rationale.

17.   **Regarding dependent claim 25**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 22, and is rejected along the same rationale.

18.   **Regarding independent claim 27**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 14, and is rejected along the same rationale.

19.   **Regarding independent claim 28**, the claim incorporates substantially similar

subject matter as claim 14, and is rejected along the same rationale.

20.   Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

CompuServe (WO97/18516) [cited by Applicant] as applied to claims 14 – 17, 19 – 25,

27 and 28 above, and further in view of Jeske (US005974443A) [as cited by Applicant].

21.   **Regarding dependent claim 26**, CompuServe does not explicitly teach **CGI**.

However, Jeske teaches that *the preferred embodiment is to use CGI 111, which is an*

industry standard method of communicating between a web server and another

program. HTTPd 103 initiates the CGIG process (common gateway interface gateway)

104, which is a program component that provides access to the agent platform 105.

Note that more than one CGIG 104 can be running on the web server 102, with one

CGIG per concurrent browser request (Column 3, lines 15 – 22), which provide that **the**

localization tool is a CGI component. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of CompuServe with

that of Jeske because such a combination would allow the users of CompuServe the

benefit of an *access tool that allows for dynamic information generation for web servers*

(Column 2, lines 54 – 55).

Response to Arguments

22.   Applicant's arguments filed 2/9/05 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

23.   In response to Applicant's argument that CompuServe fails to teach or suggest **replacing the localization tag** (p 6, last paragraph), it should be noted that CompuServe teaches that *the HTML preprocessor uses its knowledge regarding the markups, codes, data characters and the structure of HTML documents to determine which codes should be blocked from the translation process* (p 9, lines 21 – 24). The skilled artisan understands that the invention disclosed by CompuServe does not protect all the tags or codes as insinuated by Applicant. Instead the invention disclosed by CompuServe *uses its knowledge regarding the markups, codes, data characters and the structure of HTML documents to determine which codes should be blocked from the translation process* (p 9, lines 22 – 24). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention is well aware that the invention of CompuServe has the ability to translate those tags or codes that are not and should not be blocked.

Conclusion

24.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (571) 272-4091. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 10:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

NH